VII. — *Structural Variety in Attic Tragedy*

By Professor THOMAS D. GOODELL

YALE UNIVERSITY

I

THE familiar names parodos, prologos, epeisodion, and the rest, which are enumerated and partially defined in the twelfth chapter of the *Poetics*, appear to be all the terms commonly employed by the ancients to designate the regular structural parts of a tragedy. To this fact more than to anything else probably is due the widespread idea that the structure of Greek tragedy is simple, and that most tragedies are very much alike. Under one or another of these names may be placed every section of every tragedy. The additional descriptiv terms $\dot{\rho}\hat{\eta}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ and $\sigma\tau\iota\chi o\mu\upsilon\theta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ are of a similar kind, tho not quite so significant structurally. And when several plays are described as fully as they can be by all these terms together, the resultant schemes really do not differ much. It is a little as if we could do no better, in describing the faces of men, dogs, and elephants, than to say that they consist of eyes, nose, forehead, mouth, cheeks, and chin. So far the faces are indeed all alike; and the adjectivs short and long, large and small, do not go far in describing the differences, which are, nevertheless, considerable. Had Aristotle used only one more term, to mark what the French call *scène* and the Germans *Auftritt*, it would be obvious to every one that prologoi, epeisodia, and especially the exodoi of extant tragedies are far from being constructed on a simple or a single pattern. We might as truly say that all plays of five acts are constructed on a single pattern. If we take also into account the divisions made by change in delivery, from speech to song or from song to speech, or simply by the change of metrical form, within the *scène*, we become conscious of a really extraordinary variety of formal structure. This variety must have been plain to the spectator when the plays were given, whether there were ancient names for these divisions

or not.   The object of the present paper is to follow out this thought concretely.[1]   It need hardly be said that no startling discovery is to be revealed.   Every careful reader who endeavors to visualize the progress of the play is more or less conscious of the general facts which I hope to demonstrate. Every item to be mentioned here has no doubt been noted repeatedly; all are plain enough as isolated facts.   But if they have been anywhere brought together, if their combined effect as characterizing the formal structure of Attic tragedy has been pointed out, that has escaped my notice.   Certainly it has not become part of current doctrin; such elaborate editions as those of Jebb, or Kaibel's *Elektra* of Sophokles, or Wilamowitz's *Herakles*, make nothing of it.   My object, then,

---

[1] Since a well-known epitomator for Bursian's *Jahresbericht* has taken me severely to task for not playing the game according to his understanding of the rules, perhaps it will be well for me to explain what the game is which I tried to play in the paper criticized, and am trying to play in this case also.   There are questions on which complete and exact statistics are desirable, so that minute study of all the fragments of an author and careful exclusion of all lines suspected by competent scholars may be worth while; there are discussions in which the participant is bound, not only to know, but to cite scrupulously the work of all important predecessors.   But there are other questions and discussions in which the half, or even less, is better than the whole.   In those cases restraint is a virtue.   Let us observe proportion, maintain a due perspectiv.   In my paper on Bisected Trimeters (*Class. Phil.* I, 145–166), finding what appeared to me erroneous doctrin firmly settled in recent handbooks and annotated editions by distinguisht scholars, of which I cited a representativ selection, I aimed to demonstrate the error and illustrate a sounder doctrin, which British scholars had never lost, by bringing together the evidence from the only real authorities, the three tragedians themselves.   I took some pains to define terms and to point out how the unavoidable element of personal judgment made it impossible to give much weight to precise figures.   Eight generous pages of Greek trimeters, with necessary explanations, made a paper quite as long as the importance of the subject justified. Most of my readers, if they thought of the matter at all, were probably grateful that the paper was not farther burdened with footnotes and polemic.   The real question was simply whether the lines quoted did or did not contain ample and unquestionable proof of the soundness of my main contention, and on this capital point Mekler pronounced no opinion.   The ineptitude of some of his criticism of details I leave to the judgment of readers who can look beyond the printed form of words and punctuation to the sound and the substance of verse.   (Tyrrell's Introduction to his " Parnassus " edition of Sophokles, pp. vii ff., has some good remarks on this point referring to Mekler.)   Similarly in the present case, a candid reader will bear in mind my statement of the proposed goal.

is simply to set forth, in such combination as will bring out their significance, enough of these obvious facts in the extant tragedies to illustrate the variety and infinit flexibility of the ancient dramatic form. Let Aischylos, Sophokles, and Euripides do the talking so far as possible, with as little as may be from us moderns. Complete schemes of all the plays and statistics based on these schemes, and even discussion of the text, have so little value here that I shall not offer them. Several books and excellent articles that I have read will not be mentioned, and there will be few footnotes. All I hope to do is to make a little clearer one element in the subtle art of the Athenian dramatists, — which is no unworthy goal.

Need I stop to demonstrate that the appearance or withdrawal of a speaking character, and a change of metrical form, whether accompanied or not by the change from speech to song or the reverse, do constitute in Attic tragedy structural divisions of sufficient importance to justify their being regarded in this light? For the former, at least, probably not. The ordinary practis of Continental dramatists rests on a solid basis. When in daily life a second or third person, even a servant or a stranger, enters a conversation, or begins conversation with one who was alone, that always effects a change. Visibly and audibly the situation becomes different — a new grouping, a conversation where before was none, or a turn in the previous current of talk. Just as plainly also when a person leaves a small group of talkers. Still more must this be true in the drama, where no conversation may be otiose, and what appears like a trivial remark must be clearly related to the plot or to characterization. The lack of a term for these divisions in English and in Greek makes no difference with the fact that such entrances and exits of characters make, in each case, a distinct division, as visible as the fall of a curtain, audible as the change from the dialog of actors to the stasimon of a chorus, the external mark of an inner reality.[1]

---

[1] Wilamowitz calls each entire epeisodion — or rather each entire spoken dialog between two *gesangnummern* — an *Auftritt*, and remarks (*Her.* II², pp. 228 f.) in reference to the entrance of Theseus: "das auftreten einer neuen person ist

The same is true of the change of metrical form, except that this change may sometimes be merely audible. Usually in the Attic drama a shift of rhythm indicates a shift of mood so distinct that the action must at the same time have indicated this ; song, if accompanied by any form of rhythmic motion, would stand out from spoken dialog to the eye as well as the ear. Still, there were cases where the shift was too slight to be more markt by action than many transitions in straightforward iambic dialog; the ear alone would note the new rhythm as a division. This class of divisions would ordinarily be less prominent than the other class. They are like those felt in passing from one meter to another in parodos or stasimon. The resulting sections may be compared to successive strophic pairs; they would ordinarily be subordinate to the *scènes*, or *Auftritte*. They have no real analog in modern drama, where so little is made of rhythmical variety. Shakspere's occasional shift from verse to prose and the reverse is of like nature, but not so systematically employed. But the Greeks were more sensitiv to the *ethos* of rhythm. They made much of it ; we may be sure Athenian audiences, for whose delectation the dramatists composed, were quick to catch the significance of a means of dramatic expression which the dramatists employed so freely in every play.

Convenient as ancient names for such divisions would be, we have to get on without them. It is useless to ask what Aristotle would have called them. For the *scène* ὁμιλία, ἀγωγή, πρᾶξις occur to one as possible. The last is now used in Greece for act, and σκηνή for scene, but we cannot

nicht mehr zu der abgrenzung einer neuen scene verwandt, wie das in der aeltesten zeit bühnenpraxis gewesen war."

Detscheff's Göttingen doctoral dissertation (1904), *De tragoediarum conformatione scaenica ac dramatica*, takes for granted this division into scenes, and in an appendix gives brief outlines, on this basis, of all the extant Greek tragedies and those of Seneca as well. A product of the school of Leo, the paper is, of course, interesting and useful. But its different aim and setting called for a different method of exposition, with more stress on chronology; and the second element, change of metrical form within the scene, is not taken into account. Recognizing, therefore, that on one important phase of the subject Detscheff and Leo have anticipated me, I have made no change in my own paper, the substance of which my students of many years past will recognize.

imagin Aristotle employing σκηνή in that sense.   ὁμιλία
would seem not unreasonable; converse suggests on the one
hand grouping, on the other, homily, monolog.   For our im-
mediate purpose, however, the English word scene will suf-
fice, if the reader will consent to take it in the French sense.
In writing analytical schemes it is convenient to use capital
letters, A, B, C, etc., to designate the successiv scenes or
ὁμιλίαι of an epeisodion.   For the subordinate divisions re-
sulting from change of rhythm, the indefinit μόριον or τμῆμα
will serve, and numerals in written schemes.

II

To illustrate the application of this method of description,
so simple that it may at first appear to have no significance,
two plays will first be analyzed as wholes.   The search for a
typical tragedy for such a purpose brings home to one the
fact that there is none.   Each is unique, as each ode of Pin-
dar has its own metrical structure.   The *Persians* of Ais-
chylos and *Oedipus Tyrannus* of Sophokles, while illustrating
that fact, will be fairly representativ and as suggestiv as any.

The Persians [1]

PAR., 1–154.

(1) Anapestic, nine systems, 1–64: first statement of the situa-
tion.

(2) Ionic, four strophic pairs, 65–114: fear lest ἀπάτα θεῶν have
led the Persians beyond the appointed bounds.

(3) Trochaic, two strophic pairs, 115–139: forebodings of loss
and national mourning.

(4) Anapestic, four short systems, 140–154: return to calmer
mood of inquiry, and announcement of the coming of Atossa.

EPEIS. I, 155–547 : two scenes, defined by the appearance of Atossa
at 155, the arrival of the Messenger at 246, and the departure of
Atossa and the Messenger at 531.

A 155–245, Atossa and Chorus.

(1) Trochaic tetrameters, 155–175 : reverential greeting by the
Chorus, anxiety of the Queen desiring counsel.

[1] For the line numbering I follow Sidgwick's text of Aischylos (Bibliotheca
Oxon.), Jebb's of Sophokles, Nauck's of Euripides.

(2) Iambic ῥῆσις of Atossa, 176–214 : her dream.

(3) Trochaic tetrameters, 215–245 : discussion of the dream. At 246 the Messenger is seen approaching, and is the subject of the next three lines of the Chorus, who still, however, addresses the Queen in trochaic tetrameters. These three lines thus belong in form to the preceding ὁμιλία, in content they introduce the following. In other words, they are transitional; the division between the scenes is not sharply between one line and the next, but is rather the three transitional lines 246–248. The case is typical.

B 249–531, Messenger, Atossa, Chorus.

(1) Iambic trimeters, 249–255 : Messenger's report.

(2) Kommos, 256–289 : lament of Chorus in agitated rhythms, responses of Messenger in trimeters.

(3) Iambic trimeters, 290–531 : full narrativ of Messenger, dignified inquiries, reflections, and directions of Atossa.

After the withdrawal of Atossa and the Messenger at this point, in transition to the stasimon, the Chorus recites or intones an anapestic passage of three systems, 532–547. As above, such a passage, insted of belonging distinctly either to the preceding epeisodion or to the following stasimon, rather itself constitutes the division, and the link, between the two. Such are the ways of art, as of life, ways to which any science treating of life or art must conform. It is more appropriate, more in accord with facts, to call these anapests transitional than to call them either a third scene or a part of a stasimon.

STAS. I, 548–597. Three strophic pairs : somber reflections on the national disaster.

EPEIS. II, 598–851 : three scenes, defined by the appearance of Atossa at 598, the appearance of the Shade of Dareios at 681, his withdrawal at 842, the departure of Atossa at 851.

A 598–680, Atossa and Chorus.

(1) Iambic trimeters, 598–622 : ῥῆσις of Atossa asking aid in calling up Dareios.

(2) Invocation to Dareios by Chorus, 623–680. Anapestic introduction, two systems, followed by three strophic pairs and an epode.

B 681–851, Shade of Dareios with Atossa and Chorus.

(1) Iambic trimeters, 681–693 : Dareios to Chorus.

(2) Ionic expression of helpless awe from Chorus, trochaic tetrameters of Dareios in reply, 694–702.

(3) Trochaic tetrameters, 703–758 : Dareios and Atossa ; rapid statement of the disaster, and interpretation by Dareios.

(4) Iambic trimeters, 759–842 : calmer discussion between Atossa and Dareios, Chorus gradually regaining courage to join in.

C 843–851. Iambic trimeters : Atossa and Chorus. So brief a scene, and in spirit so distinctly a mere clausula to the preceding, that one might prefer not to separate it. But the formal separation seems also distinct, in that the Shade of Dareios disappears at the close of 842.

The invocation, 623–680, is called by some a stasimon. There is no definition of stasimon so clear and so universally accepted as to exclude difference of opinion on this point. But it is to be noted that Atossa remains on the scene, making offerings during the song, which is no lyric reflection on the previous epeisodion, but an appeal, at Atossa's request, to Dareios, who answers in person. The passage has no mark of the ordinary stasimon, except that it contains several strophic pairs. Otherwise it is in every way an integral part of an epeisodion, and is, I think, to be so regarded. We shall recur to this presently.

STAS. II, 852–908. Three strophic pairs and epode : mournful contrasting of the successes of Dareios with the losses of Xerxes.

EXOD., 909–1076 : one scene, Xerxes and Chorus.

(1) Anapestic, 909–921 : two recitativ systems, by Xerxes and Chorus respectivly.

(2) Kommos, 922–1076 : a προῳδός in melic anapests, followed by seven strophic pairs and an epode.

Oedipus Tyrannus

PROL., 1–150.

A 1–77, trimeters : Oedipus and the suppliants. Lines 78–84, of which the one topic is the visible approach of Kreon, are transitional.

B 85–150, trimeters : Kreon, Oedipus, and the suppliants.

PAR., 151–215. Three strophic pairs, a dramatic paian.

(1) Dactylic : appeal to Apollo, Athena, and Artemis for help.

(2) Iambic and dactylic : lyric painting of their woes.

(3) Mainly iambic, with many resolutions : renewal of the appeal, now to Apollo, Artemis, and Dionysos.

EPEIS. I, 216–462. Two scenes, defined by the entrance of Oedipus at 216 and of Teiresias at 300, and the departure of both at the end.

A 216–296, trimeters : Oedipus and Chorus. Lines 297–299 are transitional.

B 300–462 : Teiresias and Oedipus.

STAS. I, 464–512. Two strophic pairs.

(1) Mixt iambo-dactylic and anapestic : Who and where can the criminal be?

(2) Choriambic-ionic : anxiety at the prophet's words, tempered by trust in the proved goodness of their king.

EPEIS. II, 513–862. Four scenes, defined by the appearance of Kreon at 513, of Oedipus at 531, of Iokaste at 631, the withdrawal of Kreon at 677, and the withdrawal of Oedipus and Iokaste at 862.

A 513–530, trimeters : Kreon and Chorus; 531, announcing Oedipus, is transitional.

B 532–630, trimeters : Oedipus, Kreon, and Chorus; 631–633, announcing Iokaste, are transitional.

C 634–677 : Iokaste, Oedipus, Kreon, Chorus.

(1) Trimeters, 634–648 : Iokaste, Kreon, Oedipus.

(2) Kommos, 649–668 : str. α′, Chorus and Oedipus ; str. β′, Chorus.

(3) Trimeters, 669–677 : Oedipus and Kreon.

D 678–862 : Iokaste, Oedipus, Chorus.

(1) Kommos continued, 678–688 : ant. α′, Chorus and Iokaste ; ant. β′, Chorus.

(2) Trimeters, 698–862 : Iokaste, Oedipus, with but two lines (834 f.) from the Chorus.

The last two scenes, clearly separated from the preceding by the great change of tone, from angry quarrel to horror at the approaching solution, is at the same time closely united to it in form by the fact that the Kommos runs over from the former to the latter, being cut in two by the departure of Kreon. In the first strophe the Chorus plead with Oedipus for Kreon ; in the antistrophe they appeal to Iokaste to calm the king and persuade him to retire. In the second strophe and antistrophe alike the Chorus protest their loyalty and

singleness of heart. The unity in form and the minute variation which goes with perfect dramatic adaptation to the action, progressing from one scene to the next, are striking, and are characteristic of many phases of Greek art.

STAS. II, 863–910, iambic and mixt. The questions of pollution and impiety in the preceding episode, with the suggestions of violence and the doubts thrown on oracles and holy places, give rise to two strophic pairs.

(1) Prayer for purity; in contrast with the dangers of ὕβρις the excellence of emulation for public good, under divine protection.

(2) If pride and wrongdoing are unpunisht, if these oracles also are not somehow found true, religious observances are vain.

EPEIS. III, 911–1185. Five scenes, defined by the appearance of Iokaste at 911, of the Messenger from Corinth at 924, of Oedipus at 950, the departure of Iokaste at 1072, the entrance of the Servant of Laios at 1110, and the departure of Oedipus and the Servant at the end.

A Trimeters, 911–923 : Iokaste and Chorus.

B Trimeters, 924–949 : the Corinthian and Iokaste with Chorus.

C Trimeters, 950–1072 : Oedipus, the Corinthian, and Iokaste with Chorus.

D 1073–1109 : Oedipus, the Corinthian, and Chorus.

(1) Trimeters, 1073–1085 : Oedipus and Chorus.

(2) Dactylo-trochaic, 1086–1109 : joyful choral song, echoing and developing the king's expressions of pride and trust in Fortune.

E Trimeters, 1110–1185 : Oedipus, Chorus, the Servant of Laios, and the Corinthian.

The χορικόν 1086–1109 is more often called a stasimon (Jebb, Wolff-Bellerman, Schneidewin-Nauck, etc.), and we note here the same lack of an accepted definition adequate to determine the matter beyond dispute. For my present thesis — so far as it can be called a thesis — it is quite indifferent how the passage is named. If this be called a stasimon, the preceding epeisodion will contain four scenes, and we shall have one more epeisodion. But I have for many years considered the single strophe and antistrophe an integral part of the epeisodion, like Soph. *Trach.* 205–225, Aisch. *Prom.* 687–695, *Pers.* 623–680. The last is the most disputable instance I remember, and has been considered above. In all alike two characteristics are clear.

First, no one withdraws just before them; in the *Oedipus* example both Oedipus and the Corinthian remain, and there is no more break in the progress of the action than is caused by any ῥῆσις of equal length. Secondly, the song is in no sense a reflection growing out of the general course of the preceding epeisodion, as the stasimon of the normal type is; the Chorus take up merely the last remarks of the preceding speaker, responding in a more emotional way, more elaborately in a sense, but otherwise exactly as in ordinary dialog. If we press the definition of an epeisodion, as the part, possessing unity, that falls between two whole choral songs (μέρος ὅλον τὸ μεταξὺ ὅλων χορικῶν μελῶν), and so make the epeisodion end at 1085, we shall have a principle that would make the little χορικόν, Aisch. *Prom.* 687–695, a stasimon. On the other hand, if we give due value to the adjectiv ὅλον, we are again brought back to my above conclusion. At 1085 all are eagerly awaiting the herdsman, who has been sent for; the action halts an instant till he shall come; a choral song is a conventional way of suspending the sense of time, and during its course the hours necessary for fetching the slave from Kithairon may be assumed to have past; on his arrival, the action moves rapidly to the catastrophe. This brief χορικόν thus serves, not to separate two distinct epeisodia, but to bring together what in real life would be separated by hours of delay. It unites into one epeisodion two scenes that eminently belong together to make a μέρος ὅλον. But we must remember that the authenticity of that chapter of the *Poetics* is disputed, that the definitions there given are very brief, and the definition of the stasimon particularly defectiv. And finally, for my purpose at present the question is of little importance. We shall consider it again in a later section.

STAS. III, 1186–1222, two strophic pairs, glykonic and mixt. Lamentation over Oedipus; his prosperity and fall an illustration of human vicissitudes.

EXOD., 1233–1530. Four scenes, defined by the appearance of the Exangelos at 1223, of Oedipus at 1296, of Kreon at 1416, of the children (at 1425?), and by the close of the play.

A Trimeters, 1223–1296 : Exangelos and Chorus.

B 1297–1415 : Oedipus and Chorus.

(1) Kommos, 1297–1312, beginning with recitativ anapests of the Chorus, continued by melic anapests of Oedipus. A single trimeter of the Chorus enhances the contrast.

(2) Kommos continued, 1313–1328 : str. and ant. a′, dochmiacs with usual variations by Oedipus, trimeters from the Chorus.

(3) Kommos continued, 1329–1368 : str. and ant. β′, another mingling of similar elements.

(4) Trimeters, 1369–1415 : ῥῆσις of Oedipus.

C 1416–1475, trimeters : Kreon, Oedipus, and Chorus. Lines 1416–1418, announcement of Kreon's arrival, are transitional. So at the end, from 1471 Oedipus is aware of the coming of his children; we may imagin them as actually appearing at 1475, but I do not pretend to determin the precise point. And the following couplet of Kreon is still a part of the transition.

D 1475–1530 : Oedipus, Kreon, the children, Chorus.

(1) Trimeters, 1478–1514 : ῥῆσις of Oedipus.

(2) Trochaic tetrameters, 1515–1530: dialog of Oedipus and Kreon, and the closing reflections of the Chorus, — the ἐξόδιον, if we may adopt a convenient later term to distinguish from the entire exodos the brief passage that prepared or accompanied the actual exit.

After thus tracing the formal structure of two entire plays, the farther presentation of the subject will be more perspicuous if we take up in turn the several larger divisions.

III. PROLOGOS [1]

Three extant tragedies have no prologos, but open with the entrance of the chorus. These are the two earliest, the *Suppliants* and *Persians* of Aischylos, as we should expect, and the latest, the anonymous *Rhesos*, which we might not expect. The conjunction illustrates well the central fact, that no such structural formula was in the classical period fixt; the dramatist could freely vary any part to adapt it to the plot before him or to the end immediately in view.

Among extant prologoi that of the *Agamemnon*, a play which in general is very elaborate in structure, exhibits the

---

[1] The elaborate and admirable treatment of the prolog by von Arnim might seem to make this section unnecessary. But his starting-point and aim were different from mine; and it will be simplest, in order to leave no gap in my presentation, to proceed without farther reference to von Arnim's well-known paper.

simplest form; it is a single scene, and in monolog, the solil-
oquy of the Watchman, wholly in iambic trimeters.   The
Antigone and *Philoktetes* also open with prologoi in one scene,
wholly in trimeters, but with two speakers.   The *Taurian
Iphigeneia* has in the prolog two scenes, the first a monolog
of Iphigeneia, the second a dialog between Orestes and Py-
lades.   The *Herakleidai* is like this, yet different.   The
monolog of Iolaos changes at the end to a transitional passage
of seven lines, calling the children to take their stand with
him, when he sees the herald approaching; the entrance of
Kopreus brings on for the second scene a brief dialog between
him and Iolaos.   The two scenes run together instead of being
separated by the departure of the first speaker.

The *Prometheus* and the Sophoklean *Elektra* open with a
trimeter dialog of two speakers, while the second scene is a
monolog.   The monolog of Prometheus begins in trimeters,
shifts to anapests, returns to trimeters, changes again to
rhythms of agitation, and back to trimeters, ending in the
anapests that announce the approach of the chorus.   Elektra
is introduced by nine transitional lines, which might be
counted with the first scene except that they begin with her
exclamation of wo heard from within.   Her monolog is in
melic anapests, a suitable expression of her mood and a suit-
able introduction to the approaching parodos, which contains
no anapestic system.

The *Aias* and *Oedipus at Kolonos* are examples of a prolog
of three scenes, all in trimeter dialog; they are alike also in
that in both one of the interlocutors of the first scene, Odys-
seus and Antigone respectivly, remains as a silent bystander
during the second scene, and renews the conversation during
the third.

In the *Eumenides* we have a farther variation.   The first
33 trimeters of the Pythia are a monolog, a mingling of prayer
and narrativ, terminated by her entrance into the temple.
At once she hastens forth again, tells herself and the audience
what she has seen, and departs.   To the spectator this must
appear as two scenes, each a monolog of the same person,
but of totally different sentiment, separated by her withdrawal

and reappearance. Then for a third scene the audience is brought in some way to see the interior of the temple; Apollo encourages the suppliant Orestes; the brief dialog ends with the departure of Orestes. In a fourth scene the Eidolon of Klytaimestra appears chiding the sleeping Furies, who answer at first only with muttering. Whether the Furies were visible to the audience before or not, their leader now awakes and rouses the others; the prolog ends at 139, and an equally unique parodos follows.

The prologos of the *Ion* is no less remarkable in another way. There are but two scenes, both monologs. The first is a typical Euripidean opening, 81 lines of iambic narrativ and explanation by Hermes. On his departure, Ion, whom the god has just named, appears; in four recitativ anapestic systems (82–111) he paints the fresh morning scene at the Delphic temple, and mentions the tasks to which, according to daily habit, the foundling youth, a temple ministrant from early childhood, now turns. The second μόριον (112–143) is a μέλος ἀπὸ σκηνῆς, strophe and antistrophe in glykonic and more or less kindred kola, each closing with a refrain in the form of an "ejaculatory prayer," three pairs of molossi, each foot plainly indicated by the word-endings — "O Paian, O Paian, blessed, blessed be thou, O son of Leto." To this again succeeds a third μόριον (144–183), consisting chiefly of melic anapests, perhaps partly recited or half-chanted, certainly well differentiated musically as metrically from the preceding. No "dramatic lyric" of Browning is more effectiv and complete than this monolog of Ion in the portrayal of character. In the dramatic setting it would to-day hold a modern audience spellbound. And it is precisely this religious character of the youth, largely formed by the romantic scenery and the religious art amid which he has grown up, knowing no home but the temple precinct in whose pious service he has been reared, that constitutes the basis of the play, the mouthpiece of the poet's criticism of the popular religion. The care which the poet takes to elaborate this character in the prologos is a fine illustration of Euripides' dramatic skill.

The disputed prologos of the *Iphigeneia at Aulis* we will not dwell on ; but its form seems to me no argument against its genuineness.   Such variation is quite in the spirit of Euripides.   There is but one scene.   The anapestic dialog of the first and third μόρια is much like the anapestic dialog of the parodos of the *Ion ;* the long iambic ῥῆσις of Agamemnon, constituting the second section, is like the typical Euripidean opening.   The whole is eminently dramatic, and would delight the soul of a modern tragic actor.

In the *Medea*, again, the prologos is unique in that the third scene, after the monody of the Nurse and the dialog between Nurse and Paidagogos, is a dialog between the Nurse in front of the house and Medea within, the latter in melic anapests, the former in recitativ.

We turn now to the parodos.

IV. PARODOS

The differences of form in the parodos are so wide and so well recognized that no reader of Greek tragedy can overlook them ; our review of these may therefore be rapid.

The simplest type is illustrated in the *Herakles* (106-137), strophe, antistrophe, epode, 32 lines in all.   Of course this is not the earliest type.   That we find rather in the Aischylean *Suppliants* and *Persians*, in which the chorus march in to the accompaniment of several systems of anapests.   The *Agamemnon* and the *Aias* still retain this feature ; in the *Alkestis* the chorus begin with one anapestic system, in the *Rhesos* with two short ones ; in others the anapestic element is otherwise introduced, or does not appear.   In a general way the reduction of the anapestic element and the simplification of the parodos advance with the advancing decades of the fifth century.   On the other hand, the *Choephoroi* and *Eumenides*, of even date with the *Agamemnon*, and the *Seven* still earlier, have no anapests in the parodos, and some later plays have, tho it is true the anapests in the Euripidean parodoi are nearly all melic or take the form of dialog.   And the parodos of the *Bacchants* and the *Oedipus at Kolonos*, though they have no anapests, are by no means to be called simple.   In other

words, even in this part of the play where the relation between
form and date is most in evidence, that relation is far from
close, after the two earliest.

The next simplest type is seen in the *Andromache*, 30 lines
constituting two strophic pairs. The *Medea* has the one
extant example of proode, strophe, antistrophe, epode. In
the *Aias*, after four anapestic systems follow a strophe, anti-
strophe, and epode. But the effect is not the same as if the
following scene were in trimeters. At the close of the epode
Tekmessa appears and the conversation goes on in recitativ
anapests, in the course of which the emotions of the Chorus,
as their doubt and indignation at the reports change to
mournful certainty, find utterance in another strophe and
antistrophe, which are themselves separated by anapests of
Tekmessa. Thus the parodos, in the strict sense, passes over
in the succeeding epeisodion into what would be a kommatic
parodos had Tekmessa been on the scene, in front of the tent,
when the Chorus entered. Her appearance makes a clear
division between parodos and epeisodion ; but rhythmically
and musically the parodos extends 62 lines into the epeisodion.
This continuity must have enhanced the impression of rapidity
of movement.

Here may be mentioned the parodos of the *Ion*, consisting
of two strophic pairs, each in lyric dialog. The first pair is
divided between the two halves of the Chorus. The second
strophe is divided in like manner, but in shorter sections ; the
second antistrophe is apparently all sung by the whole Chorus,
or perhaps by the leader only, but its sections, correspond-
ingly to those of the strophe, are separated by the anapestic
replies of Ion. Then follows immediately the trimeter con-
versation between the unknown youth and his unrecognized
mother.

In the *Antigone* also the parodos has two strophic pairs,
but each strophe and antistrophe is followed by a single
system of recitativ anapests, all by the Chorus ; we may
represent this by a s a' s β s β' s. This precise way of blend-
ing the march anapests with song in the parodos stands alone,
but two farther developments or slight variations from it are

found in the *Prometheus* and the *Philoktetes*.   For the *Pro-metheus* the formula is still a s a' s β s β' s, but this is kom-matic; the anapests are by Prometheus insted of the Chorus. The case of the *Philoktetes* is less simple.   It might be rep-resented by the formula a s a' s β β' s γ γ'.   That is, a strophe of the Chorus is followed by an anapestic system from Neop-tolemos; the antistrophe is followed by another anapestic system, which is a brief dialog between Neoptolemos and the Chorus; the second strophe and antistrophe are not separated by anapests, but are followed by a system from Neoptolemos. That ends the anapests, but not the dialog; the third strophe, first line, of the Chorus is interrupted by a phrase of three syllables from Neoptolemos, and likewise the first line of the antistrophe, at the same point.[1]

The *Eumenides* has a simpler form of parodos than the *Philoktetes*, in that there are no anapests.   The leader of the Furies, in three trimeters, rouses the rest from slumber, and they give vent to their disappointment and indignation in three short strophic pairs, in dochmiac and related rhythms (140–177).   The *Choephoroi* and *Trachinian Women* add an epode to three rather short strophic pairs; the *Oedipus Tyr.* has three strophic pairs only, but these are more elaborate, as was pointed out above.

The parodos of the *Oedipus at Kolonos* is related, on the one side, to the *Philoktetes* and *Prometheus*, by the anapestic systems mingled with the strophic pairs, and on the other to the *Seven against Thebes*, by the addition of ἀνομοιόστροφα. In the *Seven* we have first 30 lines of ἀνομοιόστροφα and then three strophic pairs, the first pair rather long.   In the *Oedi-pus at Kolonos* the formula is a s a' s β s β', followed by 48 lines of ἀνομοιόστροφα; the first and second systems are in dialog, between Oedipus and the Chorus and between Oedi-pus and Antigone respectivly; the third is by Oedipus alone; the second strophe and antistrophe are melic dialog between

---

[1] As this is a good example of a subtle kind of assonance and correspondence often employed by Sophokles, I print the phrases here one over the other:

Ch. εὔστομ᾽ ἔχε, παῖ.   N. τί τόδε;
Ch. ἀλλ᾽ ἔχε, τέκνον.   N. λέγ᾽ ὅτι.

Oedipus, Chorus, and Antigone, the divisions exactly corre-
sponding.   And as if to complete the demonstration of his
freedom from formula, the poet gives the final melic section
of 18 lines to Antigone insted of the Chorus, and lets the
Chorus begin the trimeters of the epeisodion.   One may
question whether Sophokles had in mind any definition of
parodos, or would have cared to decide where parodos ended
and epeisodion began.   The emotions of the entering Chorus,
the old men of Kolonos, and of Oedipus and Antigone at the
danger of being driven away, demanded musical expression,
until the Chorus, after the final plea of the daughter, become
sufficiently calm to reason about the case.   No one enters at
that point, to mark in the usual way the beginning of an
epeisodion; the discussion merely calms down to the trimeter
level, as we have just seen in the *Ion*.   Still, I suppose we
should agree to consider the parodos as extending to the close
of the lyric passage, at 253.

For the parodos of the *Persians*, see above, p. 75.   That
of the *Agamemnon* is the more notable for elaborateness
because it follows the simplest possible prolog.   In length
it stands alone, 218 lines.   Resuming the mode of presenta-
tion adopted for the *Persians* and *Oedipus Tyr.*, the scheme
is as follows:

(1) Anapestic, ten systems, 40–103 : reflections of the old men
on the departure of the expedition, its object, their own age, the
meaning of these sacrifices and of the summons they have received.

(2) Lyric dactyls, one triad, 104–159 : the omens at the depart-
ure, their interpretation, the dread thereby inspired.   The com-
mon refrain is one element in binding the triad together.

(3) Trochaic, two strophic pairs, iambic, three pairs : solemn
appeal to supreme Zeus, the sacrifice at Aulis, forebodings thence
arising.

The rich elaboration of this parodos is not solely nor pri-
marily in the number of strophic forms, but largely in the
wealth of rhythmic and poetic composition, probably also of
melodic structure, in the first triad, and in the several pairs.

Similarly in the last parodos we shall consider, that of the
Sophoklean *Elektra*.   One might say simply that it consists

of three strophes and antistrophes with one epode. But that will be a very inadequate description. The special peculiarity that puts it in a class alone is that each strophe and anti-strophe, and the epode as well, is divided between the Chorus and Elektra; the whole is kommatic in a way of its own. The melic anapests of Elektra have suggested to the audi-ence the coming of the Chorus; the first strophe begins with four dactylic kola and then passes over into two iambic. Elektra's reply begins with similar dactylic kola and in like manner ends with two iambic. Thus, the first strophic pair might be said to consist of two pairs, $a \beta a' \beta'$, each division again including a rhythmic μεταβολή. And so each of the following pairs. The second strophe and antistrophe are constructed of the same elements as the first, in other pro-portions and combinations. In the third strophe the Chorus returns to the melic anapests which they heard from Elektra as they entered; this harmonizes with their momentary and partial acquiescence in her mood; their last kolon, however, is trochaic. Elektra responds with like anapests, but a larger proportion of kola in triple time, and one dactylic. And finally in the epode all the rhythmic elements of the pre-ceding strophes are, as it were, briefly resumed and brought to a harmonious close. The apparent simplicity includes a subtlety and refinement of rhythmical construction that aston-ish and charm at every reading. And the special point is that no other extant prologos is even approximately like it.

V. OTHER LYRIC FORMS

The lack of an accepted definition of the stasimon has been twice referred to. The inadequacy of that given in our text of the *Poetics* is patent, if it be taken strictly. Probably none existed in the fifth century that would stand criticism, and perhaps even Aristotle did not care to construct one. The artist usually feels no strong desire to define rigidly the pro-cesses or the products that are familiar to him; he knows them, and cares to know them, only from the other side, in the act of creation and as results of that act. His concept of them is definit enough for his purpose; it is definit enough

for the vast majority of those who are interested in the art, though it does not fully satisfy the exceptional observer who desires — usually after the creativ period is past — to study the art scientifically as well as to enjoy it.   But the desire for definition is also legitimate, tho it is by no means the first or the main thing in the study of any art.

The definition in the *Poetics*, μέλος χοροῦ τὸ ἄνευ ἀναπαί-στου καὶ τροχαίου, seems to be based on external accidents rather than on the inner nature of the thing defined; but it will include the extant stasima, if we restrict τροχαίου here to trochaic tetrameter, and insist on the term μέλος, so as to exclude from the stasima any spoken anapests of the Chorus immediately before or after the verses that were sung, and if finally we so interpret ἀναπαίστου as to admit a passage like

> ἔνοπλος γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐπενθρῴσκει
> πυρὶ καὶ στεροπαῖς ὁ Διὸς γενέτας

in the first stasimon of *Oedipus Tyr.*   But it would also include Aisch. *Prom.* 687–695, and Soph. *Phil.* 391–402 and 507–518, brief choric songs within the epeisodion, which no one calls stasima.   And then we have various choral songs in the nam-ing of which opinions differ.   One may say with reason that it makes little difference which name we apply to one of these passages in dispute, if we recognize its nature and its place in the dramatic structure.   The name, however, carries with it more or less implication as to the nature and the place of the passage in the dramatic structure, and we should prefer to agree, I suppose, if we can.

If we ask why the passages just cited in the *Persians* and the *Philoktetes* are not called stasima, the answer is clear. To take first an unmistakable external criterion, no one leaves the scene just before them.   There is no mark of division, as between what we have called ὁμιλίαι, but merely a change from speech to song.   The Chorus are not alone with the audience, nor singing as if they were alone, reflecting emo-tionally upon the course of events, or the most significant part of the course of ·events, in the preceding epeisodion. They are making a direct response to a remark, request, or

a longer ῥῆσις, which has just preceded. The same dialog continues; the words of the Chorus are simply more emotional, and more emotionally uttered. In contrast with this a stasimon is usually, if one is not willing to say always, sung by the Chorus to themselves and the audience; the speaking persons have just withdrawn. It is a musical meditation on what has filled, or taken a large place in, the preceding epeisodion. It is true that, for example, Elektra in the Sophoklean play does not withdraw at 1057; but she remains apart and is spoken of in the first antistrophe in the third person; the second person in the other strophe and antistrophe might have been used had she not been present. Chrysothemis has withdrawn; that conversation between her and Elektra is ended; the Chorus are, in a manner, summing it up. The next scene begins with the entrance of Orestes, and it is distinctly divided from the preceding. Something of this character, marking a distinct break in the action, seems to belong properly with the stasimon, tho it is difficult to put this into a brief definition.

As was said above, the passages in the *Persians* and the *Oedipus* which I was reluctant to call stasima, tho they are often so called, lack just this characteristic — the meditativ or more emotional summing up of a preceding and closed scene, which was brought to a close by the departure of one or more characters. It is the reading of the plays, not an ancient definition nor the etymology, that leads me to attach to the word στάσιμον something of the meaning of ἵστασθαι, as marking a pause in the action comparable to that between the acts of a modern play. A choric song lacking this characteristic, and constituting an integral part of a continuous scene insted of a musical curtain-fall between two distinct scenes, if it be called a stasimon, is not a stasimon of the more usual kind. The objection to calling such a song a stasimon is simply the feeling that the name tends to obscure that continuity of the action, to indicate a greater separation than exists at the point in question. Here is room, of course, for difference of taste, on which discussion is well known to be fruitless.

But here another principle should be noted. There was no law in Attic tragedy that each epeisodion must be closed by a stasimon. The only law looking in that direction is that the spoken dialog is frequently divided and diversified by song; or, to put the same thing from the Greek point of view, choral songs, the original basis, must have an adequate setting of dramatic action and speech, which last may also turn to song. Alternation of speech and song is a very flexible rule, admitting and encouraging great variety — which is precisely the subject of this paper. Accordingly, one may properly say that in the *Philoktetes* the kommos 827–864 takes the place of a second stasimon, and another kommos, 1081–1217, takes the place of a third stasimon. The former kommos consists of a strophe by the Chorus, a mesode by Neoptolemos, antistrophe and epode by the Chorus. No one departs just before this kommos; but Philoktetes' sleep of exhaustion has the same effect; the scene is closed; a stasimon would have been in place, had not the poet had something better, in that it is here dramatically more suitable. And, in fact, the deviation from the stasimon form is but slight, tho the difference in sentiment is greater. Again, at 1080 both Odysseus and Neoptolemos have withdrawn, leaving Philoktetes alone with the Chorus. Here, too, is a pause in the action, where a stasimon would have been in place. Insted of that we have two rather long strophes and antistrophes, each divided between Philoktetes and the Chorus (as in the parodos of the *Elektra*), Philoktetes taking always the earlier two thirds. This is then followed by 48 lines (in the usual numbering) of more rapid lyric dialog in ἀνομοιόστροφα.

Again, in the *Aias*, at 814 the Chorus withdraws with Tekmessa and the Messenger; in some way the scene is changed and we are outside the camp. Aias appears; his soliloquy ends at 865 and he falls on his sword. But a stasimon is impossible, as no chorus is present. In place of a stasimon, therefore, we have the ἐπιπάροδος of 13 lines without responsion. This is followed at once by a kommatic strophe and antistrophe of 31 lines each, separated by the 10 trimeter lines of Tekmessa, whose calmness, now that

the catastrophe has come, is contrasted with the despair of the Salaminian sailors and soldiers.

Going farther back, to the Oresteia, we have another epi-parodos in *Eum.* 244–275. Ten trimeters from the leader — a sort of ἐπιπρόλογος — are followed by 254–275 in dochmiac and related rhythms without responsion, distributed somehow among the members of the Chorus. Again, in 916–1020 of the same play, where a stasimon might have been expected, we have a passage which cannot be called a stasimon if ana-pests between the strophes make that name inapplicable. Nor does the content of these strophes and antistrophes resemble that of the usual stasimon. In truth, the Chorus of this play is too vigorous a participant in the action to sing such a stasimon as is suitable in the mouth of aged counsellors or sympathizing women, or even the soldiers of Aias or Neoptolemos. Their first stasimon, 321–396, is an expression of their indignation and a passionate statement of their spirit and function. It is peculiar in form, too, in that the first strophe and antistrophe end with the repeated re-frain of six kola. Their second stasimon also, of four strophic pairs, is of the most personal and dramatic character, tho more conformable than the first to the ordinary type. Then, in place of the third stasimon, we have a kommos, in form not unlike the parodos of the *Prometheus ;* the formula is a s a' s β s β' s γ s γ', where s is an anapestic system spoken by Athena. It is true, however, that these strophes are nearer in spirit to the strict stasimon than the preceding substitutes ; the Furies have become Eumenides, and dwell upon their changed attitude. Apparently they alone sing, and Athena speaks her anapests. If one prefers to call this a kommatic stasimon, I shall not quarrel with him. In the same play, too, again in conformity with the peculiarly dra-matic character of this chorus, there are two strophes and antistrophes that are integral parts of the third epeisodion, namely 778–792, 808–822, 837–847, 870–880. Trimeter speech is too tame for expressing their mingled passions in response to the decision of Athena and her gentle urgings toward reconciliation.

In the *Choephoroi* the character of the Chorus and the action combined produce a different situation. The first epeisodioń is 500 lines long. But it is broken first by a short χορικόν (152–163) that has no mark of a stasimon, like those mentioned before in the *Prometheus*, *Philoktetes*, and *Eumenides ;* the women respond to Elektra's direction κωκυτοῖς ἐπανθίζειν, παιᾶνα τοῦ θανόντος ἐξαυδωμένας, to accompany and confirm her libation. Again, an unusually long kommos, 306–478, tho it can hardly in any sense be said to take the place of a stasimon, breaks what might otherwise have seemed, in 458 B.C., too long a stretch of iambic dialog. Its length corresponds to its importance for the action, from their point of view, felt as it was to be an essential means of gaining the coöperation of the murdered Agamemnon. Orestes, Elektra, and the Chorus participate. Each of the eleven strophes is short; their complicated arrangement is indicated by the formula α β α′ s γ β′ γ′ ss δ ε δ′ s ζ ε′ ζ′ η θ ι ι′ η′ θ′ κ κ′ λ λ′ s. Orestes sings α γ δ′ ζ′ ι, Elektra sings α′ γ′ δ ζ η′ θ, the Chorus sing β β′ ε ε′ η θ′ ι′ λ λ′. Orestes sings the first line of κ and κ′, Elektra the second line of the same, the Chorus the remaining three lines of the same. The Chorus recite the anapests. The reader needs such a scheme to assist him to gather from the printed page some notion of the complexity, which in the actual rendering would, without effort on the listener's part, contribute much to the impressivness of the appeal to the powers below.

Farther, among the other notable features of the *Oedipus at Kolonos*, three epeisodia are divided by kommoi, namely 510–548, 833–843 = 876–886, and 1447–1499. All these, like that in the *Choephoroi*, are sections of their epeisodia, not substitutes for a stasimon. Meantime the fourth stasimon, 1556–1578, is of the simplest type, a single strophe and antistrophe; and the third stasimon, 1211–1248, is a single triad, tho not a short one.

The third stasimon of the *Herakles* is notable, for content in that it is a commentary on action just taking place, and for form in that it is divided into two parts by the death cries of Lykos within. Similarly in Soph. *El.* 1384–1397 the brief

stasimon fills a pause in the action as seen by the audience, and fills it with verbal images of what is going on behind the palace front.

We find, then, not only that the stasimon itself varies greatly in length and complexity of structure, but also that in place of a stasimon appears not infrequently a kommos, longer or shorter, and that other kommoi, infinitly varied in form, are made integral parts of epeisodia, and that choric songs, now a single strophe, now a responsiv pair, now a longer suite, may also be incorporated in epeisodia, while the μέλος ἀπὸ σκηνῆς introduces yet another lyric element that is even more flexible and plastic under the poet's hand than trimeter dialog.

VI. EPEISODION AND EXODOS

The outlines of two whole plays and the discussion in the previous sections leave little more to say about variety in the epeisodion. It will be enough to call attention to some features that have not been dwelt upon.

First, the length varies greatly. The third epeisodion of the *Seven* contains but 29 lines, 792–820, one scene between the Chorus and the Messenger. The second of the Aischylean *Suppliants* is shorter still, 25 lines; but we might expect this in so early a play, in which the Chorus is still the chief actor. In the *Prometheus* the second epeisodion, 436–525, is equally simple in structure, a single scene, in which Prometheus narrates to the Chorus his benefactions to man, but this contains 92 lines. The third epeisodion of the same play, 561–886, contains 326 lines, a single scene, but metrically varied, thus:

(1) Anapests, 561–565, one system, by Io as she enters.
(2) Iambic and dochmiac, 566–573, by Io.
(3) Dochmiac, etc., 574–608, str. and ant. of Io, separated by five trimeters of Prometheus.
(4) Trimeters, 609–686, Io and Prometheus.
(5) Mixt strophe, 687–695, Chorus.
(6) Trimeters, 696–876, Io, Prometheus, Chorus.
(7) Anapests, 877–886, of Io departing.

In contrast with these simpler forms we have seen the second and third epeisodia of the *Oedipus Tyr.*, of four and five scenes respectivly, three of the nine variously subdivided. Also in the *Choephoroi* the first epeisodion is of 501 lines, in two scenes, separated by the entrance of Orestes at 212, and subdivided as follows:

A 84–211, Elektra and Chorus.
  (1) Trimeters, 84–151.
  (2) χορικόν, 152–163, accompanying the libation.
  (3) Trimeters, 164–211.

B 212–584, Orestes, Elektra, Chorus.
  (1) Trimeters, 212–305.
  (2) Kommos, 306–478. (See above, p. 93.)
  (3) Trimeters, 479–584.

The third epeisodion of the same play, 838–934, less than 100 lines, contains four scenes. The epeisodia of a single play may exhibit strong contrasts in this regard. The dramatist made the epeisodia long or short, in one scene or five, according to his sense of fitness; and his sense of fitness led him to shun monotony, as in itself undesirable.

Most that has been said of epeisodia applies equally to the exodos. But some additional things may also be said. It is naturally in the last part of a tragedy that the action comes to a head. Threatened ruin and death fall, the movement is more rapid, emotions are at their hight, especially every form of sorrow. All this makes for frequent entrances and exits, for frequent changes of rhythm, for kommoi and μέλη ἀπὸ σκηνῆς. As the last μόριον also we may usually expect an ἐξόδιον — a few lines at least from the Chorus, or from some less deeply interested character, on a lower emotional level, and suitable to accompany the departure of all who are still present in the last scene.

As contrasting strongly in complexity and simplicity we may take exodoi by the same author and of the same date, those of the Orestean trilogy. We have seen that in the *Choephoroi* the first epeisodion is long and complex; the second has four scenes, the third five; the exodos, however,

is but 90 lines long and has but two scenes, the second being merely the anapestic ἐξόδιον. On the other hand, the *Aga- memnon*, which has the simplest possible prologos, has an exodos of 639 lines, as our numbers run, divided into five scenes. It includes the entire speaking rôle of Kasandra, the murder, the avowal and defence of it by Klytaimestra, the kommos between her and the Chorus, the entire part of Aigisthos. So large a segment of the plot might naturally have been divided by a fourth stasimon ; only it seemed to Aischylos preferable not to let the action stand still at any point long enough for a stasimon. The death-song of Kasan- dra, and later the kommos with Klytaimestra, both so effectiv in the dramatic portrayal of character, kept what was felt to be the proper balance between song and speech, and are more rapid than a stasimon would have been. The *Eumenides* has an exodos even simpler than that of the second member of the trilogy. Whatever one may prefer to call the passage 916–1020, all must agree that the exodos begins at 1021. After 11 trimeters of Athena, the Propompoi chant the ἐξόδιον, 14 lines in two dactylic strophes and antistrophes, the second pair with an anapestic refrain.

I have said little of the Aischylean *Suppliants*, because its archaic character sets it in many ways apart from all the other tragedies we have. But the exodos (825–1073) hardly seems archaic. It contains four scenes, defined by the arrival of the Herald to drag off the Danaids (825), the arrival of the King to rescue them (911), the departure of the Herald under guard (953), the arrival of Danaos (980). The first scene is mainly an excited kommos, with a few intersperst trimeters, but a second μόριον consists of eight trimeters. The second scene is mainly trimeters, but the last fourteen lines constitute two anapestic systems; there are indications that in this play all such anapests were sung. The fourth scene is in trimeters, until, at 1018, the ἐξόδιον begins, three strophic pairs ionic and a final pair trochaic.

So careful a scholar as Jebb makes a little miscalculation in connection with the exodos of the *Trachinian Women ;* removal of this error, coupled with due consideration of the

form of the exodos, may affect materially our judgment as to
the dramatic unity of the play.   Few modern readers care
much for this last scene — for the entire exodos is but one
scene.   Deianeira is so finely presented, and the Dorian hero
is so unjust and unfeeling, our whole sympathy is with the
faithful wife, who has bitterly atoned for her fatal mistake.
But if we cannot take the attitude which most Greeks prob-
ably found natural, we must not exaggerate our difference.
Herakles in person does not occupy the " last third of the
play," as Jebb inadvertently assumes.   The whole action
turns on Deianeira's anxiety about the absent Herakles, her
longing for his return ; the central question is, When and
how will he come ?   But his actual return, at the point of
death, does not occur till line 971.   The whole exodos con-
tains but 308 lines, less than a quarter of the 1278 lines of
the play.   In this scene the Chorus has no song ; their leader
speaks only four trimeters, the first couplet an expression of
horror at the hero's suffering, the second couplet an expression
of sorrow that Hellas must lose such a man.   Hyllos and the
Old Man enter with him, and tend him with constant affection
to the end.   That the scene is one means complete unity of
tone about Herakles, and that tone one of affectionate loyalty
and admiration, such indeed as Deianeira had constantly
maintained.   These factors would work far more profoundly
on the spectator than on the modern reader.   Such considera-
tions force me to believe that, if we were in the audience, we
should think of the Sophoklean Herakles more as we do of
his Aias.   Altho Herakles can neither pardon nor understand
the wife whose error had brought him to this torture, we in
the audience should be readier to pardon and understand him,
and to comprehend Deianeira's love and loyalty.   The last
quarter, or less, of the tragedy would be seen to be in unison
with the first three quarters.   And as was said before, the
structure of the exodos has a distinct bearing on this effect,
was an essential factor in the poet's solution of a difficult
dramatic problem.

The principle is general.   Before Aischylos wrote the *Per-
sians* he and his rivals had ready to their hand a dramatic

form so well developed, so varied, rich, and flexible, that almost any tragic subject that was suitable for dramatic representation could therein receive a worthy rendering. A wide range of plots was possible — any dramatic plot which admitted of a chorus and an outdoor setting. It is this flexibility which the present paper has aimed to bring out more plainly. Of course the admission of a third speaker in the same scene enlarged materially the resources of the dramaturge; more than three besides the chorus were scarcely necessary, and are even now less often used than one might suppose. The examples here cited seem to show no clear advance in flexibility, in the features under consideration, after the Oresteia. That taste changed in some details does not affect the truth of that statement. Fewer examples have been cited from Euripides, because they were not needed, and my point was emphasized by taking them from the older men. Indeed, whatever innovations Euripides made in myths or in music or in rhythm, his development of the "Euripidean" prolog and his fondness for the θεὸς ἀπὸ μηχανῆς in the exodos tended strongly toward simplification at both ends. Without having collected statistics on the subject, my impression is strong that in other ways too Euripides' structure is less varied than that of the two older masters. The tendency so plainly exhibited in prologos and exodos can be felt in the epeisodia. He cared more for the effectiv situation in itself than for elaborating either the approach or the dramatic solution. This is not said to disparage him. With that tendency I have no sympathy; his excellences are great enough to allow a dispassionate recognition of the sides on which he was less great. Nor is it any disparagement of the other members of the great three to agree with Freytag in regarding Sophokles as supreme in skilful dramatic construction, one element of which we have here been studying.